



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,577	01/16/2002	Horst Rathert	70418	8660
23872	7590	08/01/2007	EXAMINER	
MCGLEW & TUTTLE, PC			PETERSON, KENNETH E	
P.O. BOX 9227			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SCARBOROUGH STATION				3724
SCARBOROUGH, NY 10510-9227				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/051,577	RATHERT, HORST
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kenneth E. Peterson	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2,3,8,14 and 20-34 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 22 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2,3,8,14,20,21,26,27 and 34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 23-25 and 29-33 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 3724

1. New claims 22 and 28 are drawn to the extendable parts of the pressing elements, which are part of non-elected group III. Claims 22 and 28 stand withdrawn.

2. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The term "said pressing elements" lacks proper antecedent basis. It appears that Applicant intended for this claim to depend from claim 21, not claim 20. Accordingly, it will be examined as if it depended from 21.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3 and 14 is the term, "full area cutting table". It is not clear what weight to give the term "full" since none of Applicant's tables cover the center, as seen in figure 3.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3724

5. Claims 2,8,20,21,26,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarring (3,722,336), who shows all of the recited limitations including;

A three-side trimmer comprising:

a common support frame (see figure 2),

first and second cutting stations (1211,1212) each with a cutting unit including a cutting strip (1436 of figure 35, note lines 63,64 of column 39) and a knife (1491 of figure 35) for an oblique swing cut (figure 34) against a respective said cutting strip (1436, See note 1 below);

said each cutting unit including a unit frame (1211,1212) connecting said respective cutting strip (1436) to a respective said knife (obviously mechanically connected as see in figure 34),

each said unit frame absorbing all cutting forces between said knife and said cutting strip during the oblique swing cut (See discussion in the interview summary form of 24 July 07),

said each cutting unit being movably mounted as a unit on said common support frame (lines 25-27, column 41).

In regards to claims 21 and 27, Sarrings shows tables (inner parts of 1436) and pressing elements (1430).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarring (3,722,336), who shows all of the recited limitations as set forth above, except that the front cutting station is not clearly repositionable. However, Sarring clearly acknowledges the need to adjust the width of the cut on lines 49-54 of column 1. Given that Sarring already teaches repositioning cutting stations (the side ones) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Sarring by making the front cutting station also repositionable, in order to meet Sarring's stated objective of adjusting the width of cut.

8. Claims 23-25 and 29-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

kp



KENNETH E. PETERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER